OPTIONAL FORM NO. 10
MAY 1962 EDITION
GSA GEN. REG. NO. 27
5010-106

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : Mr. DeLoach

DATE: July 1, 1966

FROM : A. Rosen

1 - Mr. DeLoach
1 - Mr. Rosen
1 - Mr. Malley
1 - Mr. Shroder
1 - Mr. Raupach
1 - Mr. Sullivan
1 - Mr. Wick

SUBJECT: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION
CONCERNING

Tolson
DeLoach
Mohr
Conrad
Felt
Gale
Rosen
Sullivan
Tavel
Trotter
Tele. Room
Holmes
Gandy

PURPOSE:

To set forth analysis of article appearing in 7/12/66 edition of "Look" magazine concerning the article written by Fletcher Knebel, reviewing the recently published book "Inquest" authored by Edward Jay Epstein, a candidate for a doctorate degree at Harvard University.

Knebel's article derides Epstein for his superficial investigation and for distorting the facts to fit his theories and assumptions. Article mentions the Director's testimony before Warren Commission concerning the fact Oswald was never a paid informant for the FBI but contains no derogatory statements concerning the Bureau.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

Knebel, in 1955, wrote an irresponsible magazine article for "Look" concerning the Director. Since that time our contacts with him have been on a most circumspect basis and while he is treated civilly he is not trusted and is not considered to be friendly toward the Bureau.

EX-103
REC-13 62-109060 - 4143

[redacted]

ANALYSIS OF KNEBEL'S ARTICLE
"A NEW WAVE OF DOUBT"

13 JUL 18 1966

The estimate of Epstein's book can be summed up by Knebel's statements: "On first reading and even second and third, Epstein's book appears impressive . . . but I started to check some of Epstein's statements . . . and I soon became convinced Epstein was guilty of the very sins of which he accused the Warren Commission: distortion,

RIS:mpd (8)

COPY SENT TO MR. TOLSON

CONTINUED - OVER

ignoring testimony, sifting the evidence and adroitly selecting it to fit his theories and assumptions."

The article analyzes a number of statements contained in Epstein's book on which Epstein hypothecates much was left undone by the Commission in resolving what he termed to be significant discrepancies or unresolved findings.

TWO ASSASSINS INVOLVED:

The article highlights Epstein's theory that two assassins were involved in the shooting of President Kennedy. Epstein bases this on the official U. S. Navy autopsy report which states that the bullet which entered President Kennedy's back exited from the front of his throat. Epstein cites two FBI reports available to him in the National Archives, one dated 12/9/63 and the other 1/13/64, which "contradict" the autopsy report by saying that the bullet entered Kennedy's back, did not exit from his body, and thus could not have struck Governor Conna On this basis Epstein feels the time sequence of the shots fired would have precluded one bullet from hitting both the President and Connally, thus showing that a second assassin would have to be involved.

AUTOPSY REPORT:

The facts in this matter are that the Agents who attended the autopsy at the U. S. Naval Hospital, Bethesda, were advised by the examining physicians they could not locate an exit hole for the bullet entering the President's back. The doctors subsequently determined that the exit hole had been obliterated by a tracheotomy performed on the President by doctors at Parkland Hospital, Dallas. The information obtained from the autopsy physicians was furnished to the Bureau and thereafter set forth in our 12/9/63 report. This information was repeated in our 1/13/64 report, along with a statement to the effect that a bullet exit hole had been located in the shirt worn by the President. The autopsy report, as furnished orally to our Agents, was repeated in the 1/13/64 report in order to emphasize the apparent discrepancy between the oral autopsy report and our examination of the clothing without our making such a conclusion.

Memo to Mr. DeLoach from A. Rosen
Re: Assassination of President Kennedy

In commenting on the matter of the autopsy report, Knebel states: "Epstein may well be within scholarly bounds in doubting the conclusions of the autopsy physicians, but to leap to the assumption that the findings were later falsified to match a theory of the assassination that proved politically appealing is quite a leap for an academician."

Knebel concludes his article by stating it is doubtful that flashing a caution light on Epstein's book will have much effect in staying the new clamor over the Warren Commission report and he quotes Allen Dulles as saying: "If they found another assassin, let them name names and produce their evidence."

ACTION:

This is submitted for information.